



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Palmerston, Grey, Wellington, and, for France, Louis Philippe, Royer-Collard, Guizot and Thiers. One can hardly imagine a more disagreeable portrait than that drawn for Lord Brougham: "Cet étrange Chancelier, sans dignité, sans convenance, sale, cynique, grossier, se grisant de vin et de paroles, vulgaire dans ses propos, malappris dans ses façons", who "venait dîner ici, hier, en redingote, mangeant avec ses doigts, me tapant sur l'épaule et racontant cinquante ordures". But Mme. de Dino had a sincere admiration for Wellington and Grey, and her descriptions of the Princess Victoria are charming. Scattered through the volume are some of the best of Talleyrand's *bon mots*.

It should be added that the *Chronique* contains a detailed statement of the manner and spirit in which Talleyrand composed his memoirs. According to Mme. de Dino's account it was the ignorance displayed by Lacretelle in a work on the eighteenth century that prompted Talleyrand to undertake the sketch of a period which he thought had been most misunderstood. This was in 1809. Shortly afterwards he wrote upon the group of incidents in which the Duke of Orleans was the principal figure. This so delighted his friends that from 1810 to 1814 he was busied upon memoirs, in which he embodied large parts of the two sketches. Mme. de Dino says that so many of his papers were either lost or mislaid that he was obliged to rely chiefly upon his memory. During the Restoration the memoirs were worked over again and again, and parts of them read to so many persons that she was afraid that unauthentic memoirs might appear to deprive the authentic memoirs of interest. She adds that they were more than ordinarily free from anything that seemed libellous. This statement indicates that some of the arguments made during the controversy over the authenticity of the Talleyrand memoirs in 1891 were beside the mark.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late Lord ACTON, LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History. Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., and STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Volume XI. *The Growth of Nationalities.* (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1909. Pp. xl, 1044.)

PERHAPS in no other volume of this series has the need of a unifying hand been so much felt as in this; for by no stretch of the imagination can the Principle of Nationality be used as the touchstone for world-history between 1840 and 1870. However, since a label was needed, this may serve as well as another. The editors have had to have recourse to several foreign scholars in order to cover the cosmopolitan field outside of Great Britain and her colonies which are here dealt with. Does this practice show the limitations of English historical scholarship? A German or French co-operative history would probably be written wholly by Germans or Frenchmen. On the

other hand, Lord Acton's successors can plead that, by borrowing, they secure in each case a supposed expert. But is it not at least debatable whether in a work which purports to give the best *British* opinion on modern history, there should be interspersed the opinions of foreigners? Every student of the creation of the German Empire will go to German sources for the facts; has he not a right here to look for an English (and not German) interpretation of these facts? This is not the place for discussing these questions, but it is well to ask them.

And to ask them does not imply that the foreign contributors fall short. The editors would have had to search far to find men better qualified than Professors Émile Bourgeois, Ernesto Masi and H. Friedjung, to whom are respectively assigned several of the most important sections concerning France, Italy and Austria. The late Sir Spencer Walpole deals with England from 1852 to 1868; Dr. A. W. Ward with Revolution and Reaction in Germany, 1848-1850; and M. Albert Thomas, one of the ablest of the younger French historians, with the Second Empire. Dr. G. Roloff has the crucial chapter on Bismarck and German Unity. But it is not so much the description of these main-travelled historical roads which gives this volume novelty as the account of the secondary or more remote countries. Here is an excellent chapter by Mr. G. A. Fawkes, on Rome and the Vatican Council. Here the English reader will find succinctly told the story of Belgium and Holland, of Spain and Switzerland, of Scandinavia and Russia, of India, Japan, China and Australasia. The editors have followed the methods of the earlier volumes in mingling political history and economic, religious and social, literary and aesthetic.

In brief space such a volume cannot be reviewed: at the most, a reviewer can only mention characteristic traits. It may seem paradoxical to say that the deepest impression this volume makes is of its lack of impressiveness. There is a dead level of more than respectable scholarship—an immense accumulation of facts—yet hardly more distinction than you meet in a dictionary. Is this because the editors have pumice-stoned the salient features of their contributors away, or have the contributors insensibly depersonalized themselves in their effort to conform to the specifications of an impersonal enterprise? The late Ernesto Masi, for instance, both in his writing and in his talk showed a mind at once keen and nimble; you would hardly suspect this from his chapters here. So Walpole's history has a sturdy individuality which seems to have evaporated when he wrote the present summaries. More noteworthy still is the fact that, in a volume of some 400,000 words, having to do with some of the greatest personages of modern times, there is not a ten-line pen-portrait of real vividness. The style throughout is so standardized that you cannot tell the translations from the original English contributions. This may be a tribute to the trans-

lator's skill, but it somewhat discredits the natives. If you met them, you would find that each had his individual voice, manner and opinions; is it on the whole desirable that their writings should be shorn of individuality, and give forth a monotonous conformity? Must the general levelling tendency inseparable from such a work be so obviously yielded to? The reader will reply according to his tastes.

When, however, this tendency invades historical statements themselves, it is time to protest. Such an invasion appears, for example, in Dr. Roloff's disingenuous description of the opening of the Franco-Prussian War. After stating that France's "preposterous demand . . . was curtly rejected by the King personally and by Bismarck officially", he adds: "He [Bismarck] immediately made these last dealings public, so that the German nation might be fully cognizant of the obtrusiveness of the French policy and the repulse it had received, and in order to 'wave the red rag before the Gallic bull'" (p. 463). Dr. Roloff concludes: "The war appears to have been inevitable, but the occasion and pretext were selected by Bismarck. . . . It has often been stated subsequently that the war was Bismarck's doing. . . . But it can easily be shown that it was not in Bismarck's power to avoid the war, since Napoleon had long been making careful preparation for it." This is not adequate treatment, in a serious history, of the most important single European event in the past forty years; but we must at least admire the sublime *hauteur* with which the German apologist refuses even to discuss the doctored Ems despatch. A similar desire to gloze or dodge appears in other cases. We find no mention of the punishment inflicted on the rebellious Sepoys; yet posterity has a right to know that a Christian nation like England blew its Indian rebels to pieces at the cannon's mouth. So we should be told that Bazaine's surrender at Metz aroused a bitter dispute as to his integrity; and we should be furnished a candid statement of the Spanish marriages. These are a few tests, which might be greatly multiplied. They raise the question, What audience does such a history address?

No review, however brief, can overlook the hopeless confusion in proper names. Here indeed a sane standardizer is needed at every turn. Remembering that at the beginning of their undertaking the editors informed the English-speaking world that America was discovered by *Cristoforo Colombo* (I. 7) we feared what would happen when they came to deal with the proper names of this period. Sometimes they use the foreign form *literatim*, which leads to such an absurdity as "Elsass and Lothringen" (p. 49) in an English book; elsewhere (p. 612, for instance) the proper English words—Alsace and Lorraine—are given. We find "Cech" (p. 46) and "Jellačić" (p. 177): but the symbols "č" and "ć" are not and never have been English. It would be no whit less absurd to print the Russian names

in Russian letters; or to speak of the reigning English family as the House of Braunschweig; or to write København for Copenhagen. Again such a solecism as Lombardo-Venetia could only be equalled by Anglo-Scotland, which the editors would scarcely sanction. Why should Princess Belgioioso's Christian name be spelt Christina (p. 85) and the Queen of Spain's Cristina (p. 553)? A similar muddle prevails in the use of italics. There is no more reason for italicizing Reichstag than for italicizing Parliament; and if bourgeoisie and régime are not now naturalized English words, when will they be? And surely some mention should be made in the text that the battle of Königsgrätz is more commonly known as Sadowa. A list of misprints in proper names would be long. The bibliographies fill 115 pages, and again they make us ask why so much space has been devoted to material that is incomplete from the start and bound to become obsolete in a few years. These bibliographies are too imperfect to be of service to the specialist, and too miscellaneous for the general reader. To take a single example: Under the title "Cavour" the volumes of letters edited by Mayor and Bert are omitted; the monographs by Mazade and Zanichelli are omitted; Massari's biography, which is as much a "first source" (though far different in excellence) as Morley's *Gladstone*, is omitted; Bianchi's brief memoir and indispensable *La Politique de Cavour* are omitted; Bonghi's sketch is omitted; Countess Martingo Cesaresco's admirable volume is omitted; and in place of all these we find E. Cadogan's spurious biography! An examination of other sections might reveal similar gaps and similar anomalies.

France and the Alliances: the Struggle for the Balance of Power.

By ANDRÉ TARDIEU, Honorary First Secretary in the French Diplomatic Service. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. x, 314.)

THE writing of contemporary history is quite the most difficult form of the historical discipline. This volume unfolds a story of great interest and high importance in a very attractive form. Yet throughout there is a haunting sense in the reader's mind that the nice equilibrium of civilization as described by a professional journalist is a sort of chimera; unreal and unstable. The story of how France, humbled to the dust in 1870, has now regained her seat at the council board of Europe and secured a peaceful revenge on the empire which was built at her expense, is well told by M. Tardieu, and told as he believes it. He likewise gives his authorities. But is it historically true?

Such volumes must be read with great caution; they are journalistic rather than historical and really argue by assumption. For instance, it is assumed throughout the book that the official, governmental France here pictured is the whole of France, whereas the France which has achieved so much is the France of a minority. There is a socialistic